

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter in terms of claims 5-10, 19-24, 29, 32-34.

Rejected Subject Matter

While the applicant believes that all of the claims presently define over the cited art, it appears that the Examiner reads the rejected claims somewhat differently than does applicant. In order to help ensure that the Examiner accords the same scope to the claims as intended by the Applicant, the independent claims are being amended slightly by this amendment (which accompanies a RCE) to address this issue.

Claim 1, prior to this amendment, includes the passage:

“a first computing entity arranged to encrypt a first data set based on encryption parameters that comprise:
public data of a trusted party, and
an encryption key string comprising a second data set that defines a policy for allowing the output of the first data set onto a said removable storage medium,”

Based paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Official Action it appears that the Examiner interprets the quoted passage from claim 1 as follows:

“encryption of content with a first encryption key and encrypting the first encrypting key with a second encryption key wherein the first encryption key defines a policy for allowing the output of the content”

The Examiner has chosen this interpretation because it is he can map this interpretation onto Pienado.

At first sight, it is not obvious, how the Examiner's interpretation maps to the stated features of the claim 1. However, the Examiner's explanation of

how his interpreted form of claim 1 applies to Pienado (see top of page 3 of the Official Action) implies the following mapping between the actual features of claim 1 and the Examiner's interpretation:

<u>Claim 1</u>	<u>Examiner's Interpretation</u>
First data set	content
Encryption key string	first encryption key
Public data	second encryption key

Thus, using the claim 1 language, the Examiner's interpretation amounts to:

"encrypting the first data set with an encryption key string and then encrypting the encryption key with the public data"

How the Examiner arrives at such an interpretation is a bit of a mystery (other than the fact that it helps facilitate the rejection) since the current specification does not disclose encrypting the encryption key string using the public data (though it is correct to consider the public data as being a public key). The specification passage (page 7, line 9 – page 9, line 10) referred to by the Examiner in support of his interpretation certainly does not disclose encrypting the encryption key string.

In any event, claim 1 has been amended with an eye to making such an interpretation as made by the Examiner impossible. Claim 28 has also been amended to try to make the interpretation given by the Examiner impossible.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is

authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this paper (and any enclosure referred to in this paper) is being transmitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on

Respectfully submitted,

April 15, 2008

(Date of Transmission)

Stacey Dawson

(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Stacey Dawson/

(Signature)

April 15, 2008

(Date)

/Richard P. Berg 28,145/

Richard Berg
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 28,145
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile